



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY
REGION IX
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

OCT 24 2016

Mr. Karl Tupper
Air Quality Specialist
Monitoring Division
San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District
3433 Roberto Court
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Dear Mr. Tupper:

Thank you for your submission of the San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District's (SLOCAPCD's) 2016 Ambient Air Monitoring Network Plan in June 2016. We have reviewed the submitted document based on the requirements set forth under 40 CFR 58. Based on the information provided in the plan, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) approves all portions of the network plan except those specifically identified below.

Please note that we cannot approve portions of the annual network plan for which the information in the plan is insufficient to judge whether the requirement has been met, or for which the information, as described, does not meet the requirements as specified in 40 CFR 58.10 and the associated appendices. EPA Region 9 also cannot approve portions of the plan for which the EPA Administrator has not delegated approval authority to the regional offices. Accordingly, the first enclosure (*A. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Items where EPA is Not Taking Action*) provides a listing of specific items of your agency's annual monitoring network plan where EPA is not taking action. The second enclosure (*B. Additional Items Requiring Attention*) is a listing of additional items in the plan that EPA wishes to bring to your agency's attention.

The third enclosure (*C. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Checklist*) is the checklist EPA used to review your plan for overall items that are required to be included in the annual network plan along with our assessment of whether the plan submitted by your agency addresses those requirements. The first two enclosures highlight a subset of the more extensive list of items reviewed in the third enclosure. All comments conveyed via this letter (and enclosures) should be addressed (through corrections within the plan, additional information being included, or discussion) in next year's annual monitoring network plan.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or the enclosed comments, please feel free to contact me at (415) 947-4134 or Dena Vallano at (415) 972-3134.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gwen m. J.", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Gwen Yoshimura, Acting Manager
Air Quality Analysis Office

Enclosures:

- A. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Items where EPA is Not Taking Action
- B. Additional Items Requiring Attention
- C. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Checklist

cc (via email): Larry Allen, SLOCAPCD
Kevin Kaizuka, SLOCAPCD
Gayle Sweigert, California Air Resources Board
Rebekka Fine, California Air Resources Board
Kyle Vagadori, California Air Resources Board

A. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Items where EPA is Not Taking Action

We are not acting on the portions of annual network plans where either EPA Region 9 lacks the authority to approve specific items of the plan, or EPA has determined that a requirement is either not met or information in the plan is insufficient to judge whether the requirement has been met.

- EPA identified items in your agency's annual monitoring network plan where a requirement was not being met or information in the plan was insufficient to judge whether the requirement was being met based on 40 CFR 58.10 and the associated appendices. Therefore, we are not acting on the following items:

Item	Checklist Row	Issue
Statement that SPMs operating an FRM/FEM/ARM that meet Appendix E also meet either Appendix A or an approved alternative.	14	Not meeting requirement
Distance from supporting structure	81	Insufficient to judge in some instances
Scale of representativeness	73	Insufficient to judge in one instance

Additional information for each of these items may be found for the row listed in column 2, in the third enclosure (*C. Annual Monitoring Network Plan Checklist*).

B. Additional Items Requiring Attention

- [General] The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O₃, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, NO₂, SO₂, CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).
- [Item 37] The plan lists the number of required PM₁₀ sites as 0-1. According to the 2015 population estimate (~280k) and the 2015 maximum concentration (149 µg/m³), the required minimum number of PM₁₀ monitoring sites is 1-2. SLOCAPCD meets the minimum monitoring requirements, but please correct this information in next year's plan, if applicable.

C. ANNUAL MONITORING NETWORK PLAN CHECKLIST
(Updated February 10, 2016)

Year: 2016

Agency: San Luis Obispo County Air Pollution Control District (SLOCAPCD)

40 CFR 58.10(a)(1) requires that each Annual Network Plan (ANP) include information regarding the following types of monitors: SLAMS monitoring stations including FRM, FEM, and ARM monitors that are part of SLAMS, NCore stations, STN stations, State speciation stations, SPM stations, and/or, in serious, severe and extreme ozone nonattainment areas, and PAMS stations.

40 CFR 58.10(a)(1) further directs that, "The plan shall include a statement of purposes for each monitor and evidence that siting and operation of each monitor meets the requirements of appendices A, C, D, and E of this part, where applicable." On this basis, review of the ANPs is based on the requirements listed in 58.10 along with those in Appendices A, C, D, and E.

EPA Region 9 will not take action to approve or disapprove any item for which Part 58 grants approval authority to the Administrator rather than the Regional Administrators, but we will do a check to see if the required information is included and correct. The items requiring approval by the Administrator are: PAMS, NCORE, and Speciation (STN/CSN).

Please note that this checklist summarizes many of the requirements of 40 CFR Part 58, but does not substitute for those requirements, nor do its contents provide a binding determination of compliance with those requirements. The checklist is subject to revision in the future and we welcome comments on its contents and structure.

Key:

White	meets the requirement
Yellow	requirement is not met, or information is insufficient to make a determination. Action requested in next year's plan or outside the ANP process (items listed in Enclosure A).
Green	item requires attention in order to improve next year's plan (items listed in Enclosure B).

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ³ ?	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
GENERAL PLAN REQUIREMENTS					
1.	Submit plan by July 1 st	58.10 (a)(1)	Yes, Cover letter	Yes	Plan was submitted on June 24, 2016
2.	30-day public comment / inspection period ⁶	58.10 (a)(1), 58.10 (a)(2)	Yes, Cover letter and p.4	Yes	May 23-June 23, 2016
3.	Modifications to SLAMS network – case when we are not approving system modifications	58.10 (a)(2) 58.10 (b)(5) 58.10(e) 58.14	NA, pp 9-10	NA	
4.	Modifications to SLAMS network – case when we are approving system modifications per 58.14	58.10 (a)(2) 58.10 (b)(5) 58.10(e) 58.14	NA	NA	
5.	Does plan include documentation (e.g., attached approval letter) for system modifications that have been approved since last ANP approval?		Yes, Appendices D and E	Yes	The Morro Bay NO ₂ SLAMS monitor was approved for discontinuation on March 28, 2016.
6.	Any proposals to remove or move a monitoring station within a period of 18 months following plan submittal	58.10 (b)(5)	NA, p. 17	NA	
7.	A plan for establishing a near-road PM _{2.5} monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015 (plan was due July 1, 2014)	58.10(a)(8)(i)	NA	NA	
8.	A plan for establishing a near-road PM _{2.5} monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 1 million and ≤ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2017 (plan due July 1, 2016)	58.10(a)(8)(ii)	NA	NA	

¹ Unless otherwise noted.

² Response options: NA (Not Applicable), Yes, No, Incomplete, Incorrect. The responses “Incomplete” and “Incorrect” assume that some information has been provided.

³ To the best of our knowledge.

⁴ Assuming the information is correct

⁵ Response options: NA (Not Applicable) – [reason], Yes, No, Insufficient to Judge.

⁶ The affected state or local agency must document the process for obtaining public comment and include any comments received through the public notification process within their submitted plan.

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ³	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
9. A plan for establishing a near-road CO monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015 (plan was due July 1, 2014)	58.10(a)(7) 58.13(e)(1)	NA	NA	
10. A plan for establishing a near-road CO monitor (in CBSAs ≥ 1 million and ≤ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2017 (plan due July 1, 2016)	58.10(a)(7) 58.13(e)(1)	NA	NA	
11. NO _x plan for establishment of 2 nd near-road monitor by 1/1/2015 (plan was due July 1, 2014)	58.10 (a)(5)(iv)	NA	NA	
12. Precision/Accuracy reports submitted to AQS	58.16(a); App A.1.3 and 5.1.1	Yes, p. 18	Yes	
13. Annual data certification submitted	58.15 App. A 1.3	Yes, p. 18	Yes	
14. Statement that SPMs operating an FRM/FEM/ARM that meet Appendix E also meet either Appendix A or an approved alternative. Documentation for any Appendix A approved alternative should be included. ⁷	58.11 (a) (2)	Incomplete, pp. 9, 15, 44-45	Not meeting requirement	Please include a statement noting whether the Oso Elaco PM ₁₀ monitor is meeting this requirement in next year's plan.
15. SPMs operating FRM/FEM/ARM monitors for over 24 months are listed as comparable to the NAAQS or the agency provided documentation that requirements from Appendices A, C, or E were not met. ⁸	58.20(c)	NA	NA	
16. For agencies that share monitoring responsibilities in an MSA/CSA: this agency meets full monitoring requirements or an agreement between the affected agencies and the EPA Regional Administrator is in place	App D 2(e)	Yes, p. 7	Yes	

GENERAL PARTICULATE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS (PM₁₀, PM_{2.5}, Pb-TSP, Pb-PM₁₀)

⁷ Alternatives to the requirements of appendix A may be approved for an SPM site as part of the approval of the annual monitoring plan, or separately.

⁸ This requirement only applies to monitors that are eligible for comparison to the NAAQS per 40 CFR §§58.11(e) and 58.30.

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ³	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
17. Designation of a primary monitor if there is more than one monitor for a pollutant at a site.	Need to determine collocation	NA	NA	
18. Distance between QA collocated monitors (Note: waiver request or the date of previous waiver approval must be included if the distance deviates from requirement.)	App. A 3.2.5.6 and 3.2.6.3	NA, p. 24	NA	
19. For low volume PM instruments (flow rate < 200 liters/minute), all other PM instruments are > 1 m from the hivol. If no, list distance (meters) and instruments.	App E	Yes, App. C	Yes	
20. For high volume PM instruments (flow rate > 200 liters/minute), all other PM instruments are > 2m from the hivol. If no, list distance (meters) and instruments.	App E	NA	NA	

PM_{2.5}-SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

21. Document how states and local agencies provide for the review of changes to a PM _{2.5} monitoring network that impact the location of a violating PM _{2.5} monitor.	58.10 (c)	Yes, p. 17	Yes	
22. Identification of any PM _{2.5} FEMs and/or ARMs not eligible to be compared to the NAAQS due to poor comparability to FRM(s) [Note 1: must include required data assessment.] [Note 2: Required SLAMS must monitor PM _{2.5} with <u>NAAQS</u> -comparable monitor at the required sample frequency.]	58.10 (b)(13) 58.11 (e)	NA	NA	
23. Minimum # of monitoring sites for PM _{2.5} [Note 1: should be supported by MSA ID, MSA population, DV, # monitoring sites, and # required monitoring sites] [Note 2: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMS are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D, 4.7.1(a) and Table D-5	Yes, p. 21	Yes	The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O ₃ , PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ , NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).
24. Requirements for continuous PM _{2.5} monitoring (number of monitors and collocation)	App D 4.7.2	Yes, p. 20	Yes	SLOCAPCD is part of the ARB PQAO, and relies on the entire PQAO network to satisfy collocation.

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ³	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
25. FRM/FEM/ARM PM _{2.5} QA collocation	App A 3.2.5	NA, pp. 14, App. B	NA	See Row 24.
26. PM _{2.5} Chemical Speciation requirements for official STN sites	App D 4.7.4	NA	NA	
27. Identification of sites suitable and sites not suitable for comparison to the annual PM _{2.5} NAAQS as described in Part 58.30	58.10 (b)(7)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
28. Required PM _{2.5} sites represent area-wide air quality	App D 4.7.1(b)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
29. For PM _{2.5} , within each MSA, at least one site at neighborhood or larger scale in an area of expected maximum concentration	App D 4.7.1(b)(1)	Yes, p. 32	Yes	
30. Minimum monitoring requirement for near-road PM _{2.5} monitor (in CBSA ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015	58.13(d)(1) App D 4.7.1(b)(2)	NA	NA	The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O ₃ , PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ , NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).
31. If additional SLAMS PM _{2.5} is required, there is a site in an area of poor air quality	App D 4.7.1(b)(3)	NA	NA	
32. States must have at least one PM _{2.5} regional background and one PM _{2.5} regional transport site.	App D 4.7.3	NA	NA – State Requirement	This is a state requirement to be addressed by ARB.
33. Sampling schedule for PM _{2.5} - applies to year-round and seasonal sampling schedules (note: date of waiver approval must be included if the sampling season deviates from requirement)	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(d) App D 4.7 EPA flowchart	Yes, p. 14 and App. C	Yes	All continuous
34. Frequency of flow rate verification for manual PM _{2.5} monitors audit	App A 3.3.2	NA	NA	
35. Frequency of flow rate verification for automated PM _{2.5} monitors audit	App A 3.2.3	Yes, App. C	Yes	
36. Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in CY2015 for PM _{2.5} monitors	App A, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3	Yes, App. C	Yes	

PM₁₀ – SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

	ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ³ ?	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
37.	Minimum # of monitoring sites for PM ₁₀ [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D. 4.6 (a) and Table D-4	Yes, p. 21	Yes	<p>The plan lists the number of required PM₁₀ sites as 0-1. According to 2015 population estimate (~280k) and the 2015 maximum concentration (149 µg/m³), the required minimum # of PM₁₀ monitoring sites is 1-2. SLOCAPCD meets the minimum monitoring requirements, but please correct this information in next year's plan, if applicable.</p> <p>The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O₃, PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀, NO₂, SO₂, CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).</p>
38.	Manual PM ₁₀ method collocation (note: continuous PM ₁₀ does not have this requirement)	App A 3.3.1	NA	NA	NA
39.	Sampling schedule for PM ₁₀	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(e) App D 4.6	Yes, p. 14 and App. C	Yes	All continuous
40.	Frequency of flow rate verification for manual PM ₁₀ monitors audit	App A 3.3.2	NA	NA	
41.	Frequency of flow rate verification for automated PM ₁₀ monitors audit	App A 3.2.3	Yes, App. C	Yes	
42.	Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in CY2015 for PM ₁₀ monitors	App A, 3.2.4 and 3.3.3	Yes, App. C	Yes	

Pb –SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

43.	Minimum # of monitors for non-NCore Pb [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D 4.5 58.13(a)	NA, p. 16, 23	NA	
44.	Pb collocation: for non-NCore sites	App A 3.3.4.3	NA	NA	
45.	Any source-oriented Pb site for which a waiver has been granted by EPA Regional Administrator	58.10 (b)(10)	NA	NA	
46.	Any Pb monitor for which a waiver has been requested or granted by EPA Regional Administrator for use of Pb-PM ₁₀ in lieu of Pb-TSP	58.10 (b)(11)	NA	NA	

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ³	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
47. Designation of any Pb monitors as either source-oriented or non-source-oriented	58.10 (b)(9)	NA	NA	
48. Sampling schedule for Pb	58.10 (b)(4) 58.12(b) App D 4.5	NA	NA	
49. Frequency of flow rate verification for Pb monitors audit	App A 3.3.4.1	NA	NA	
50. Dates of two semi-annual flow rate audits conducted in CY2015 for Pb monitors	App A 3.3.4.1	NA	NA	

GENERAL GASEOUS MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

51. Frequency of one-point QC check (gaseous)	App. A 3.2.1	Yes, App. C	Yes	
52. Date of Annual Performance Evaluation (gaseous) conducted in CY2015	App. A 3.2.2	Yes, App. C	Yes	

O₃-SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

53. Minimum # of monitoring sites for O ₃ [Note 1: should be supported by MSA ID, MSA population, DV, # monitoring sites, and # required monitoring sites] [Note 2: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.] [Note 3: monitors that do not meet traffic count distance requirements to be neighborhood or urban scale (40 CFR Appendix E, Table E-1) cannot be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements]	App D, 4.1(a) and Table D-2	Yes, p. 19	Yes	The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O ₃ , PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ , NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).
54. Identification of maximum concentration O ₃ site(s)	App D 4.1 (b)	Yes, p. 12	Yes	
55. Sampling season for O ₃ (Note: Waivers must be renewed annually. EPA expects agencies to submit re-evaluations of the relevant data each year with the ANP. EPA will then respond as part of the ANP response.)	58.10 (b)(4) App D, 4.1(i)	Yes, App. C	Yes	All year-round.

NO₂-SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

56. Minimum monitoring requirement for single near-road NO ₂ monitor (in CBSA > 1 million) by	58.13(c)(3) App D 4.3.2	NA, p. 21	NA	The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables
--	----------------------------	-----------	----	--

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ³	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
				(O ₃ , PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ , NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).
	1/1/2014[Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]			
57.	Minimum monitoring requirement for second near-road NO ₂ monitor (in CBSA ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015 ⁹ [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	58.13(c)(4) App D 4.3.2	NA	
58.	Minimum monitoring requirements for area-wide NO ₂ monitor in location of expected highest NO ₂ concentrations representing neighborhood or larger scale (operation required by January 1, 2013) ⁹	App D 4.3.3	NA, pp. 13, 21	NA
59.	Minimum monitoring requirements for susceptible and vulnerable populations monitoring (aka RA40) NO ₂ (operation required by January 1, 2013) ⁹	App D 4.3.4	NA, pp. 13, 21	NA
60.	Identification of required NO ₂ monitors as either near-road, area-wide, or vulnerable and susceptible population (aka RA40)	58.10 (b)(12)	NA, pp. 13, 21	NA
CO-SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS				
61.	Minimum monitoring requirement for near-road CO monitor (in CBSA ≥ 2.5 million) by 1/1/2015 ⁹	58.13(c)(1) App D 4.2.1	NA, p. 16, 22	NA
				The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O ₃ , PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ , NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).
SO₂-SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS				
62.	Minimum monitoring requirements for SO ₂ based on PWEI and/or RA required monitors under Appendix D 4.4.3 [Note: Only monitors considered to be required SLAMs are eligible to be counted towards meeting minimum monitoring requirements.]	App D 4.4	NA, pp. 13-14, 22	NA
				The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O ₃ , PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ , NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect ³ ?	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
63. Monitors used to meet Data Requirements Rule included in July 1, 2016 ANP (to be installed no later than January 1, 2017).	40 CFR 51.1203(c)	NA, p. 14	NA	

NCORE – SPECIFIC MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

64. NCORE site and all required parameters operational: year-round O ₃ , trace SO ₂ , trace CO, NO _x , NO, PM _{2.5} mass, PM _{2.5} continuous, PM _{10-2.5} specification, PM _{10-2.5} mass, resultant wind speed at 10m, resultant wind direction at 10m, ambient temperature, relative humidity, and Pb at CBSAs ≥ 500,000.	58.10 (a)(3); Pb collocation App. A 3.3.4.3, PM _{10-2.5} minimum monitoring App. D 4.8; PM _{10-2.5} collocation App. A 3.3.6	NA, p. 16	NA	The plan includes population census estimates from 2010 in all minimum monitoring requirement tables (O ₃ , PM _{2.5} , PM ₁₀ , NO ₂ , SO ₂ , CO, and Pb). Please use the most recent available census estimates in next year's plan (i.e., 2016).
---	--	-----------	----	--

SITE OR MONITOR - SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS (OFTEN INCLUDED IN DETAILED SITE INFORMATION TABLES)

65. AQS site identification number for each site	58.10 (b)(1)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
66. Location of each site: street address and geographic coordinates	58.10 (b)(2)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
67. MSA, CBSA, CSA or other area represented by the monitor	58.10 (b)(8)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
68. Parameter occurrence code for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Yes, App. C	Yes	

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ³	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
69. Statement of purpose for each monitor	58.10 (a)(1)	Yes, pp. 11-16	Yes	
70. Basic monitoring objective for each monitor	App D 1.1 58.10 (b)(6)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
71. Site type for each monitor	App D 1.1.1	Yes, App. C	Yes	
72. Monitor type for each monitor, and Network Affiliation(s) as appropriate	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Yes, App. C	Yes	
73. Scale of representativeness for each monitor as defined in Appendix D	58.10(b)(6); App D	Yes, App. C	Insufficient to judge in one instance	The Paso Robles PM ₁₀ monitor is listed as neighborhood scale in the site table, but as urban scale on p. 15. Please clarify or correct the scale or site type to be consistent with each other in next year's plan.
74. Parameter code for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and collocation) are met	Yes, App. C	Yes	
75. Method code and description (e.g., manufacturer & model) for each monitor	58.10 (b)(3); App C 2.4.1.2	Yes, App. C	Yes	
76. Sampling start date for each monitor	Needed to determine if other requirements (e.g., min # and	Yes, App. C	Yes	

ANP requirement	Citation within 40 CFR 58 ¹	Was the information submitted? ² If yes, page #s. Flag if incorrect? ³	Does the information provided ⁴ meet the requirement? ⁵	Notes
	collocation) are met			
77. Distance of monitor from nearest road	App E 6	Yes, App. C	Yes	
78. Traffic count of nearest road	App E	Yes, App. C	Yes	
79. Groundcover	App E 3(a)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
80. Probe height	App E 2	Yes, App. C	Yes	
81. Distance from supporting structure	App E 2	Yes, App. C	Insufficient to judge in some instances	The following monitors may not be meeting the requirement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDE – PM₁₀ (1.4m), PM_{2.5} (1.4m) Nipomo – PM₁₀ (1.7m) Atascadero – PM₁₀ (1.7m)
82. Distance from obstructions on roof (horizontal distance to the obstruction and vertical height of the obstruction above the probe should be provided)	App E 4(b)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
83. Distance from obstructions not on roof (horizontal distance to the obstruction and vertical height of the obstruction above the probe should be provided)	App E 4(a)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
84. Distance from the drip line of closest tree(s)	App E 5	Yes, App. C	Yes	
85. Distance to furnace or incinerator flue	App E 3(b)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
86. Unrestricted airflow (expressed as degrees around probe/inlet or percentage of monitoring path)	App E, 4(a) and 4(b)	Yes, App. C	Yes	
87. Probe material (NO/NO ₂ /NO _x , SO ₂ , O ₃ ; For PAMS: VOCs, Carbonyls)	App E 9	Yes, App. C	Yes	
88. Residence time (NO/NO ₂ /NO _x , SO ₂ , O ₃ ; For PAMS: VOCs, Carbonyls)	App E 9	Yes, App. C	Yes	

Public Comments on Annual Network Plan

Were comments submitted to the S/L/T agency during the public comment period?

No.

If no, skip the remaining questions.

If yes:

- Were any of the comments substantive?

- If yes, which ones?
- Explain basis for determination if any comments were considered not substantive:
- Did the agency respond to the substantive comments?
- If yes, was the response adequate?
- Do the substantive comments require separate EPA response (i.e., agency response wasn't adequate)?
- Are the sections of the annual network plan that received substantive comments approvable after consideration of comments?
- If yes, provide rationale: